

### REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-33 and 35-38 will be pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 9-12, 22-23, 25-30 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,087,937 (McCarthy). Claims 4-6, 8, 31-33 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,081 (Chesnutt). Claims 7, 24 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,685 (Struble). Claims 13-15, 20-21 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,239 (Jespersen). Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of Jespersen and further in view of Chesnutt. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of Jespersen and further in view of Struble. Applicant respectfully traverses all outstanding rejections.

### *Interview Summary*

Applicant's undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiners Nam Nguyen and Wendy Garber participated in a telephonic interview on August 30, 2006 to discuss claim the foregoing claim amendments. Examiners Nam Nguyen and Wendy Garber stated that the foregoing claim amendments appeared to overcome the outstanding rejections.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1-3, 9-12, 22-23, 25-30 and 36-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,087,937 (McCarthy). Applicant respectfully traverses.

McCarthy does not teach or suggest, "in response to receiving the disabling signal, transmitting from the device TCP/IP routing information corresponding to the device," as recited in independent claim 1 (and similar language from independent claims 22, 28 and 37). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 22, 28 and 37 are not anticipated by McCarthy. Applicant further submits that claims 2-3, 9-12, 23-23, 25-27, 29,

30 and 36 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

1. Claims 4-6, 8, 31-33 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,081 (Chesnutt). Applicant respectfully traverses and submits claims 4-6, 8, 31-33 and 35 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency.

2. Claims 7, 24 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,685 (Struble). Applicant respectfully traverses and submits claim 24 is patentable at least by reason of its dependency. Claims 7 and 34 are hereby canceled.

3. Claims 13-15, 20-21 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,239 (Jespersen). Applicant respectfully traverses.

McCarthy does not teach or suggest, “in response to the timeout condition, transmitting from the device TCP/IP routing information corresponding to the device,” as recited in independent claim 13 (and similar language from independent claim 38). Jespersen also fails to teach or suggest this feature. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 13 and 38 are patentable over the cited references. Applicant further submits that claims 14, 15, 20 and 21 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency.

4. Claims 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of Jespersen and further in view of Chesnutt. Applicant respectfully traverses and submits claims 16-18 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency.

5. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of Jespersen and further in view of Struble. Claim 19 is hereby

**DOCKET NO.:** 305412.01 / MSFT-2783  
**Application No.:** 10/676,967  
**Office Action Dated:** August 3, 2006

**PATENT  
AMENDMENTS AND ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT  
OF PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS  
PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 1.114**

canceled. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.


**DOCKET NO.:** 305412.01 / MSFT-2783  
**Application No.:** 10/676,967  
**Office Action Dated:** August 3, 2006

**PATENT  
AMENDMENTS AND ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT  
OF PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS  
PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 1.114**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant further submits that no new matter has been added by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: October 3, 2006

  
Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439